APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/454,755	12/06/1999	SACHIKO NISHIURA	4432-19	4202

7590   02/11/2002

LAFF WHITESEL CONTE & SARET
401 NORTH MICHIGAN AVENUE
CHICAGO, IL 60611

EXAMINER
YANG, RYAN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2672	

DATE MAILED: 02/11/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
        application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *3* .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-27 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 10 and 19 are independent

claims. This action is non-final.

This application claims foreign priority dated 12/9/98.

2.   The present title of the invention is "Apparatus and Method for Converting an

Object Display Description Document".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4.   Claims 1-3, 6-12, 15-21 and 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by Politis (US 6,191,797).

5.   As per claim 1, Politis discloses an apparatus for converting an object display

description document, comprising a generating means for generating, from a set of

source objects in the document, a set of new objects fewer than said set of source

objects, to obtain a display image equivalent to the display image obtained from said set

of source objects (Figure 1, where image A and B are combined in various way into a single image).

6.   Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Berend et al. (US 5,692,117).

As per claim 1, Berend et al., hereinafter Berend, discloses an apparatus for converting an object display description document, comprising a generating means for generating, from a set of source objects in the document, a set of new objects fewer than said set of source objects, to obtain a display image equivalent to the display image obtained from said set of source objects (Figure 62a and 62b where 62a shows two overlapping objects and 62b shows combined object has fewer source objects than 62a).

7.   As per claim 2, Politis demonstrated all the elements as applied in the rejection of independent claim 1, supra, and further discloses said generating means deletes source objects hidden spatially behind another source object which is not transparent nor translucent (Figure 1, where portion of B is deleted by overlapped part of A in A OVER B).

8.   As per claim 2, Berend demonstrated all the elements as applied in the rejection of independent claim 1, supra, and further discloses said generating means deletes source objects hidden spatially behind another source object which is not transparent nor translucent (Figure 62a and 62b, "to cause the overlapping portions of the outline curves not to be displayed ... so that the overlapping sections of each boundary curve are rendered invisible when displayed", column 51, line 21-30).

9.   As per claim 3, Politis demonstrated all the elements as applied in the rejection of
independent claim 1, supra, and further discloses said generating means generates a
new object based on a transparent or translucent source object and other source
objects located at a lower layer than a layer including said transparent or translucent
source object therein and spatially overlapping said transparent or translucent source
object (Table 1, where various composition methods are shown utilizing different
operators and Do, Bo and Ao are alpha channel values of the images, column 3, line 61
– column 4, line 4).

10.   As per claim 3, Berend demonstrated all the elements as applied in the rejection
of independent claim 1, supra, and further discloses said generating means generates a
new object based on a transparent or translucent source object and other source
objects located at a lower layer than a layer including said transparent or translucent
source object therein and spatially overlapping said transparent or translucent source
object (Figure 62a and 62b).

11   As per claim 4, Berend demonstrated all the elements as applied in the rejection
of dependent claim 3 , supra, and further discloses generation of said new object from
said transparent or translucent source object and said other source objects is performed
for a time range in which said transparent or translucent source object spatially overlaps
said other source objects ("Another type of amendment involves moving a frame or a
series of frames in time ... and to generate new intervening frames (or delete old
frames) as required", column 20, line 39-47).

12.   As per claim 5, Berend demonstrated all the elements as applied in the rejection

of independent claim 1, supra, and further discloses said generating means deletes a

source object when a display time for said source object is out of a display time range

for said set of source objects ("Another type of amendment involves moving a frame or

a series of frames in time ... and to generate new intervening frames (or delete old

frames) as required", column 20, line 39-47).

13.   As per claim 6, Politis demonstrated all the elements as applied in the rejection of

independent claim 1, supra, and further discloses a means for storing said set of new

objects to a storage medium (Figure 12 1206).

14.   As per claim 6, Berend demonstrated all the elements as applied in the rejection

of independent claim 1, supra, and further discloses a means for storing said set of new

objects to a storage medium (Figure 3 120).

15.   As per claim 7, Politis demonstrated all the elements as applied in the rejection of

independent claim 1, supra, and further discloses a means for selectively storing said

set of source objects or said set of new objects to a storage medium (Figure 12 1206).

16.   As per claim 7, Berend demonstrated all the elements as applied in the rejection

of independent claim 1, supra, and further discloses a means for selectively storing said

set of source objects or said set of new objects to a storage medium (Figure 3 120).

17.   As per claim 8, Politis demonstrated all the elements as applied in the rejection of

independent claim 1, supra, and further discloses a means for displaying said set of

new objects, wherein said apparatus is used as a browser (Figure 12 1216 where the

quadtree (a region or a portion of an image) is stored).

18. As per claim 8, Berend demonstrated all the elements as applied in the rejection of independent claim 1, supra, and further discloses a means for displaying said set of new objects, wherein said apparatus is used as a browser (Figure 5, where the animator workstations 110a ... 110c can retrieve data from file server 180).

19. As per claim 9, Politis demonstrated all the elements as applied in the rejection of independent claim 1, supra, and further discloses a means for selectively displaying said set of source objects or said set of new objects, wherein said apparatus is used as a browser (Figure 12 1216 where the quadtree is stored).

20. As per claim 9, Berend demonstrated all the elements as applied in the rejection of independent claim 1, supra, and further discloses a means for selectively displaying said set of source objects or said set of new objects, wherein said apparatus is used as a browser (Figure 5, where the animator workstations 110a ... 110c can selectively retrieve data from file server 180).

21. As per claims 10-12 and 15-18, since Politis' disclosure is for a method, apparatus and system (see Abstract) for optimizing an expressing tree, the claims are similarly rejected as claims 1-3 and 6-9, respectively, by Politis.

22. As per claims 10-18, since Berend's disclosure is for a method and apparatus for producing animated drawing, the claims are similarly rejected as claims 1-9, respectively, by Berend.

23. As per claims 19-21 and 24-27, since Politis' disclosure is used in computer graphics, it is obvious the method can be in the form of computer program, therefore is similarly rejected as claims 1-3 and 6-9, respectively, by Politis.

24.   As per claims 19-27, since Berend's disclosure is used in computer animation, it

is obvious the method can be in the form of computer program, therefore is similarly

rejected as claims 1-9, respectively, by Berend.

Conclusion

25.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Inquiries

26.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to **Ryan Yang** whose telephone number is **(703) 308-**

6133.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, **Michael Razavi**, can be reached at **(703) 305-4713**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal

Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office

whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Ryan Yang
January 30, 2002

JEFFERY BRIER
PRIMARY EXAMINER